

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

RONALD R. SANTOS,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

ISIDRO BACA, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:11-cv-01251-KJD-NJK

ORDER GRANTING IN PART
EXTENSION OF DISCOVERY

(Docket No. 140)

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion for reinstatement of scheduling order to allow additional discovery to be completed. Docket No. 140. Plaintiff is proceeding in this action *pro se*. This is Plaintiff's third request to extend discovery. *See* Docket Nos. 88, 108, 140.

Plaintiff originally filed his third request to extend discovery deadlines on May 29, 2015. Docket No. 117. Defendants opposed the motion because they asserted that Plaintiff had failed to establish good cause for the extension of discovery. Docket No. 124. However, Defendants admit in their opposition that, at the time of the filing, they had not provided discovery responses to all of Plaintiff's discovery requests. *Id.*, at 3.

On June 24, 2015, the Court stayed the case because Plaintiff was under suicide watch, and denied without prejudice Plaintiff's motion to extend. Docket No. 128. On July 20, 2015, the Court lifted the stay because Plaintiff was no longer on suicide watch and ordered Plaintiff to re-file his discovery motions. Docket No. 134. Plaintiff filed his renewed motion to extend discovery on August 3, 2015. Docket No. 140.

1 Plaintiff represents that he has not received responses to his interrogatories to Defendants
2 Cole Morrow and Brian Connett. *Id.*, at 1. Plaintiff further represents that he has not received
3 responses to his request for productions served on May 27, 2015. *Id.*, at 2. As such, Plaintiff
4 requests that the Court extend the discovery period by ninety days because “there are still issues to
5 address in discovery.” *Id.*, at 3. Plaintiff also requests that Defendants provide the Court “a copy
6 of all letters relating to discovery that they have received, to confirm diligence of Plaintiff regarding
7 this entire process.” *Id.*, at 4.

8 The Court finds that good cause exists to extend the discovery deadline and, therefore, does
9 not need copies of the parties’ correspondence to decide this motion. The Court hereby **GRANTS**
10 an extension of the discovery deadline by ninety days, to September 28, 2015. Accordingly,
11 Plaintiff’s motion for reinstatement of scheduling order to allow additional discovery to be
12 completed (Docket No. 140) is hereby **GRANTED in part and DENIED in part**.

13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 DATED: August 11, 2015

15
16 
17 _____
NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge